DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 083 EC 132 508

AUTHOR Rice, Eric
TITLE Program Accessibility for the Handicapped: A Study of a Planning Model.
INSTITUTION System Sciences, Inc., Chapel Hill, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 80
CONTRACT 300-78-0592
NOTE 20p.: Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980, Session 14.04).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accessibility (for Disabled); *Administrator Role; *Disabilities; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Management Development; Material Development; *Program Development; *Vocational Education; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The paper reports the development of a set of planning materials (a series of eight booklets) to assist local special and vocational education administrators to overcome barriers to program and facility accessibility for handicapped students in vocational, occupational, and technical education. The project was conducted in three phases: (1) development, field testing, and revision of the planning materials; (2) development and testing of workshop materials to teach the use of the planning process to local and state educational administrators; and (3) planning and implementation of a series of regional dissemination workshops to distribute the materials to every state. Field test findings suggested that, while some revisions were required in the materials before general use, the Planning System was a viable tool for planning for accessibility. The field test also suggested that administrators were ready, willing, and capable of addressing the accessibility issue--particularly if the means for addressing accessibility improved programs, provided for personal growth and advancement, and moved the system toward federal compliance. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEC 1980
ERIC/TM

ED201083

PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE HANDICAPPED:

A STUDY OF A PLANNING MODEL

ERIC RICE

System Sciences, Inc.
P.O. Box 2345
Chapel Hill NC 27514

Presented: American Educational Research Association
7-11 April 1980, Boston, Massachusetts
Session 14.04, The Impact of P.L. 94-142
on Administration

Funded by: The U.S. Department of Education
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
Contract #300780592

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eric Rice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC132508

PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE HANDICAPPED: A STUDY OF A PLANNING MODEL

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

It is the right of every school-aged citizen of the United States to have provided for them a free and appropriate public education. However, historically, some segments of American society have not enjoyed this educational right because a variety of barriers has prevented their accessing public educational and training opportunities, particularly those opportunities that might be more immediately useful to them. This has been especially true of secondary and postsecondary level disabled students who have not had access to occupational, vocational and technical skill training programs. As a result, only two-fifths of the mentally and physically disabled adults are employed during a typical year, as compared with three-fourths of all non-disabled adults. Average weekly wages of employed disabled males are 22% lower than those of their non-disabled counterparts (Levitan and Taggard, 1977).

Within training programs, the lack of provision of service is even more obvious. Even though P.L. 94-482, The Education Amendments of 1976, Title II, specifies a set-aside of 10% of the total grant award for handicapped students, disabled students comprise only 2% of the total enrollment in vocational education programs (U.S.O.E., 1978). Further, the Office of Civil Rights continues to process reports of scores of violations, ranging from unthinking to flagrant, that limit access to vocational training programs for handicapped individuals (Federal Register, 1979).

The problem of inaccessibility to eductional training programs has continued in spite of Federal legislative initiatives in the form of P.L. 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975; P.L. 94-482, The Education Amendments of 1976, Title II; P.L. 93-112 (as amended), The Rehabilitation Acts; and P.L. 90-480, The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968. Therefore, the Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, awarded a series of contracts to help local educational administrators improve the provision of services to handicapped students.

Reported in this paper is the development of a set of planning materials to assist local special and vocational education administrators to overcome barriers to program and facility accessibility for handicapped students in vocational, occupational and technical education. The project was conducted in three phases: (1) develop, field test and revise the planning materials; (2) develop and test workshop materials to teach the use of the planning process to local and state educational administrators; and (3) plan and conduct a series of regional dissemination workshops to distribute the materials to every state. This paper reports findings of phase one, field testing the planning process and materials. The purposes of the field test were to monitor and evaluate use of the Planning System in a sample of educational units in order to insure that the process and materials were useful and usable.

APPROACH AND PROCEDURES

Process and Materials Development

Project staff, in conjunction with the Federal Project Officer and the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), the expert group selected to provide advice to the project, created a set of specifications that clarified the general requirement that the Planning System be "useful and usable." These resulting eight initial requirements influenced the structure of the Planning System:

1) The planning system was to be logical and conform to accepted practice in human service planning.
2) The planning system was to be usable in any public education setting.
3) The system was to be highly "transportable" from school unit to school unit.
4) The planning system was to be adaptable such that local school units could use the system regardless of how much progress the school unit had made toward becoming accessible.
5) The planning system was to facilitate removal of four types of barriers: (a) attitude, (b) policy/practice, (c) architecture/transportation/equipment, and (4) communications.

6) The planning system was to assist school units to come into compliance with applicable law.
7) The planning system was not to appear overwhelming to local education administrators.
8) The planning system was to contain only those procedures which were (a) adaptable to the issue of program accessibility, (b) relatively easy to use, and (c) sufficiently discussed in the research literature for a detailed description of the procedure to be written.

With these requirements in mind, a five-step Planning System and related materials were developed that conformed to the General Systems Model of Planning (Kaufman, 1972). The suggested procedures within each step were adapted from literature in public administration, health administration, educational administration, business administration, special education, vocational education, sociology and psychology. Each step was developed as a discrete process in order that local administrators could use only those steps that were applicable to their situation. Within most steps, multiple planning procedures were offered in order that local administrators could match school characteristics and planning technique requirements. In two steps, only group decision-making procedures were provided due to Federal regulations that require consumers or citizens to be included in the delivery system planning. The five-step process and suggested alternative procedures are displayed in Fig. 1, Outline of the Planning System.

The Planning System was written as a series of eight booklets and packaged in a cardboard slipcover. Only one booklet, the Guide to the Planning System, was to be read in its entirety; it explained the system, described the options available to the local administrator, required decisions on planning procedures to be used, and directed activity throughout the planning process. Five of the other booklets, one for each step in the Planning System, were written as self-instructional texts. Each booklet contained detailed descriptions of the different planning procedures available for that step in the system. In addition, the booklet on identifying barriers contained attitude, policy/practice, and architecture surveys. The seventh and eighth booklets were supplemental resource guides, one that identified and briefly described exemplary programs and practices serving special needs students in

STEP 1: IDENTIFYING BARRIERS

- Survey
- Delphi Procedure
- Nominal Group Technique
- Outside Experts/Consultants
- Community Impressions Procedures

STEP 2: ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES AND GOALS

- Modified Nominal Group Technique

STEP 3: GENERATING STRATEGIES FOR REMOVING BARRIERS

- Brainstorming
- Force Field Analysis
- Nominal Group Technique
- Synectics
- Simulation

STEP 4: SELECTING A STRATEGY

- Costs and Constraints: The "Reasonableness" Criterion
- Congruence Between Needs, Goals, Objectives and Strategies: The "Goodness-of-Fit" Criterion
- Cost Requirements: The "Affordability" Criterion
- Resource Allocation Possibilities: The "Best Return and Management" Criterion

  - Cost-Effectiveness Technique
  - Cost-Benefit Technique
  - Management by Objectives Technique
  - Program Planning and Budgeting System
  - Performance Evaluation Review Technique
  - Decision Trees
  - Decision Matrices

- General Criteria: The "Other Considerations" Criterion

STEP 5: REMOVING BARRIERS

Fig. 1. Outline of Planning System

vocational education and the other that listed documents and organizations which could be utilized in removing barriers and creating accessible programs.

After initial production of the materials, they were subjected to external review by Federal reviewers, the Technical Advisory Committee, and a team of experts in the field. Suggested revisions in language, format, content and directions from each group of reviewers were incorporated into the materials before the field test.

Field Test Approach

In order to establish usability and usefulness of the Planning System, a "quasi-case study" field test of the process was conducted in four different educational settings over a five-month period. Project staff introduced the Planning System, provided technical assistance to the educational unit upon request, monitored the process through its use, and collected information documenting the effectiveness of the System. The approach was termed a "quasi-case study" because, not only was each situation to be analyzed independently, but, also, results across educational settings were to be analyzed for similarities. Issues of particular concern were:

1) What were the specific processes and outcomes of using the Planning System in each of the selected educational units? Attention was given to procedures selected, findings, required resources, role and organizational position of the person assigned responsibility for using the System, outcomes, problems encountered, and overall evaluation of the system.
2) What suggestions were offered to improve the planning process and materials?
3) Was the Planning System useful for making programs accessible? Was the System logical? How successful was the use of multiple strategies in each step as well as self-instructional text?
4) Was the Planning System usable from the perspective of the administrator?

Site Selection

Vocational education is offered in over 14,000 school districts and several thousand community colleges, public junior colleges and technical

institutes. It is also provided in more than 2,000 secondary and post-secondary area vocational schools that have as their primary mission the teaching of skills that lead to employment. From this pool of potential schools, a representative sample of four school units was drawn using a stratified, weighted, nonreplacement design. Requirements of the sampling process were specified in the contract and by the Technical Advisory Group and included:

1) Geographic representation of the four Department of Education Regions;
2) At least two secondary and one postsecondary educational unit;
3) At least one comprehensive high school and at least one area vocational school;
4) At least one urban, one suburban, and one rural educational unit; and
5) Maximal variability across the four sites on enrollments, socioeconomic status, the existence of teacher unions, and the number of training programs offered.

Using available data sources, all school districts, area vocational schools, and two-year postsecondary programs were grouped according to geographic location (east, south, west, central), grade level and type of delivery system (postsecondary/secondary, comprehensive high school, and area vocational school), and environmental setting (urban, suburban, rural).

The typical number of program offerings, enrollments, and socioeconomic status were computed for each educational unit and units were ranked on the variables as high, medium or low; the presence or absence of teacher unions also was noted. Four sets of four sites were selected that provided maximized variance on the computed variables and met the specifications in terms of geography, grade level, delivery system, and degree of urbanization. The sets were ranked by TAG. (Multiple sets had been selected and ranked so that if one unit in any set declined to participate, another set could be selected.) The top ranked set agreed to participate. Descriptions of the sites selected appear in Figure 2, Site Characteristics.

Site A:	Site B:
Location: South	Location: East
Degree of Urbanization: Rural	Degree of Urbanization: Suburban
Level and Type of Delivery System: Secondary, Comprehensive High School	Level and Type of Delivery System: Secondary, Area Vocational School, Comprehensive High School
Existence of Teacher Unions: Absent	Existence of Teacher Unions: Present
Socioeconomic Status: Low	Socioeconomic Status: High
Program Offerings: Medium	Program Offerings: Low
Enrollment: Medium	Enrollment: Low
Site C:	**Site D:**
Location: Central	Location: West
Degree of Urbanization: Urban	Degree of Urbanization: Suburban
Level and Type of Delivery System: Secondary, Postsecondary, Comprehensive High School, Technical High School, Community College	Level and Type of Delivery System: Community College
Existence of Teacher Unions: Present	Existence of Teacher Unions: Present
Socioeconomic Status: Medium	Socioeconomic Status: Medium
Program Offerings: High	Program Offerings: Medium
Enrollment: High	Enrollment: Medium

Fig. 2. Site Characteristics

Data Collection and Analysis

Data on usefulness and usability of the planning procedures were collected through interviews during the field test and through interviews and questionnaires at the end of the procedure. In addition, local education administrators who directed the use of the Planning System kept an anecdotal record of his/her activities, impressions, decisions, and suggestions while directing the planning.

Data analyses took three forms. First, activities were monitored in each educational unit via a traditional case study method to determine the results of the Planning System for that unit. Findings and local decisions evaluated by project staff in terms of the local education situation

to determine validity, resource requirements and usefulness. Second, consistencies between two or more respondents with similar role responsibilities across educational units and consistencies between two or more respondents who were involved in the same step of the Planning System within individual educational units were examined. Third, all suggested changes in the process or materials were logged and grouped according to similarity for use in revising the materials.

RESULTS

In order to report findings of the case studies efficiently, results have been grouped under three major headings: usefulness, usability, and suggested revisions. Usefulness refers to the validity of the process and the specific results and resource requirements associated with use of the Planning System in individual educational units. Usability refers to the effect of the Planning System on individual educational administrators and their organizations. Suggested revisions refers to those items consistently mentioned as needing revision in the next edition of the Planning System.

Findings Related to Usefulness

The specific results of the field test of the Planning System have been displayed in a condensed form in Figure 3, Field Test Results. As noted in the figure, the Planning System was used to completion in three of the four sites. At those sites, each of the first four steps was completed using one of the suggested procedures. Further, in each case, the fifth step was begun and the barrier removal strategies implemented. In the fourth field test, the materials were given a relatively low priority. In this latter instance, group techniques were declined in favor of individual techniques and, ultimately, the materials were not used. Excellent suggestions for revising the materials were offered, however.

Site A: South, rural, comprehensive high school

1. Total time lapse, initiation to completion: 4.0 months
2. Total number of people involved in planning process: 20 people
3. Total resource expenditure:
   a. Administrator time: 120 hours
   b. Staff and committee time: 60 hours
   c. Dollars: $350
   d. Facilities: One classroom for 8 hours

4. Role of person assigned responsibility to use System: Vocational Education Director

5. Orientation to use of materials:

   a. Major reason: An opportunity to be among the first in the region to verify program accessibility and an opportunity for free technical assistance.

   b. Major barrier: Architectural barriers

6. Techniques selected and information derived:

   a. Step 1: Identifying barriers

      1) Procedure: Survey
      2) Results: Identified six architectural areas of concern including inaccessible stairway to second floor, parking lot difficulties, and an inaccessible lunchroom.

   b. Step 2: Establishing priorities and goals

      1) Procedure: Modified Nominal Group
      2) Results: Most important goal was rendering second floor programs physically accessible.

   c. Step 3: Generating strategies

      1) Procedure: Brainstorming
      2) Results: A series of strategies ranging from installation of an elevator to three types of ramps.

   d) Step 4: Selecting strategies

      1) Procedure: Resource allocation, Decision Matrix
      2) Results: Selection of a particular ramp design and securing of initial resources toward construction

7. Outcomes realized: An effective and inexpensive strategy for making the second level of the vocational building accessible to physically disabled students.

8. Problems encountered: Directions for some of the steps of the Planning system for the architectural survey and for the costing and resource allocation procedures were unclear. The Local Planning Committee sometimes became confused. The process was time consuming.

9. General Evaluation: Materials were judged to have been very useful and applicable to the given situation. Group decision-making procedures were viewed as particularly useful.

Site B: East, suburban, area vocational school and comprehensive high school

1. Total time lapse, initiation to completion: 3 months
2. Total number of people involved in planning process: 6 people

3. Total resource expenditure:

   a. Administrator time: 56 hours
   b. Staff and committee time: 160 hours
   c. Dollars: $300
   d. Facilities: Reproduction, mailing, coding, and data analysis facilities

4. Role of person assigned responsibility to use System: Vocational Education Director

5. Orientation to use of materials:

   a. Major reason: To demonstrate evidence of compliance with the law
   b. Major barrier: Staff attitudes

6. Techniques selected and information derived:

   a. Step 1: Identifying barriers

      1) Procedure: Survey and Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: Major barriers identified lack of public and staff awareness, insufficient in-service training, lack of trained support personnel, and fear.

   b. Step 2: Establishing priorities and goals

      1) Procedure: Weighted scoring of Survey and an administrative committee
      2) Results: Most critical goal was improving staff and public awareness about needs and abilities of disabled students.

   c. Step 3: Generating strategies: none to date

      1) Procedure:
      2) Results:

   d) Step 4: Selecting strategies: none to date

      1) Procedure:
      2) Results:

7. Outcomes realized: None to date

8. Problems encountered: The System lacked sufficient information about how to adapt surveys to local situations; the materials lacked a monitoring component; and the System lacked specific suggestions about who in the school system should be responsible.

9. General evaluation: The System received a good evaluation. They concluded that the group techniques and procedures would have been a better choice for their efforts. The difficulty was the lack of time and the high "labor-intensive" process.

Site C: Central, urban, technical high school, comprehensive high school, technical institute

1. Total time lapse, initiation to completion: 5 months
2. Total number of people involved in planning process: 12 people

3. Total resource expenditure:

   a. Administrator time: 160 hours
   b. Staff and committee time: 192 hours
   c. Dollars: $500
   d. Facilities: classroom space for 16 hours and duplication facilities

4. Role of person assigned responsibility to use System: Director of Special Needs Resource Center

5. Orientation to use of materials:

   a. Major reason: To make program accessible in order to recruit new students and to provide better services to those enrolled.
   b. Major barrier: Non-specific, but particularly concerned with attitude

6. Techniques selected and information derived:

   a. Step 1: Identifying barriers

      1) Procedure: Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: Nine categories of barriers including agency isolation, lack of staff awareness, lack of knowledge about working with handicapped students, negative self-image of disabled, lack of qualified support staff, lack of appropriate instructional materials.

   b. Step 2: Establishing priorities and goals

      1) Procedure: Modified Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: Most important goal was development of appropriate recognition and treatment by staff for all types of disability and positive staff attitudes pertaining to working with disabled students.

   c. Step 3: Generating strategies

      1) Procedure: Force Field Analysis
      2) Results: Strategies included a comprehensive staff development program, new staff positions, new procedures for providing assessment and services to handicapped students and a publicity and recruitment program.

   d. Step 4: Selecting strategies

      1) Procedure: "Goodness-of-fit" criterion and the Performance Review Technique
      2) Results: The primary strategies selected were initiation of a comprehensive staff development program coupled with a renewed recruitment program.

7. Outcomes realized: A comprehensive program for rendering the entire program accessible including a staff development program, recruitment program and budgetary request during the coming calendar year.

8. Problems encountered: Materials did not contain suggestions about how this planning process fits into the overall school planning process. There were also some procedural difficulties in some techniques for establishing priorities, strategy selection steps, and implementation steps.

9. General evaluation: Materials were judged to have been excellent. The rational approach and the Planning Records particularly were useful. Administrators found the various group decision making techniques have been particularly beneficial.

Site D: West, suburban, community college

1. Total time lapse, initiation to completion: 2.5 months
2. Total number of people involved in planning process: 7 people
3. Total resource expenditure:
   a. Administrator time: 40 hours
   b. Staff and committee time: 40 hours
   c. Dollars: N/A
   d. Facilities: One classroom for 6 hours
4. Role of person assigned responsibility to use System: Special Education Coordinator
5. Orientation to use of materials:
   a. Major reason: Improve services to enrolled students and increase future enrollment.
   b. Major barrier: Policy and practice.
6. Techniques selected and information derived:
   a. Step 1: Identifying barriers
      1) Procedure: Outside Expert and Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: Identified barriers in school mission statement, organizational structure, recruitment program, and the lack of a consistent and permanent referral and service delivery system.
   b. Step 2: Establishing priorities and goals
      1) Procedure: Modified Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: The most critical goal was to establish a consistent and permanent referral and service delivery system in school policy.
   c. Step 3: Generating strategies
      1) Procedure: Nominal Group Technique
      2) Results: Suggested a variety of service delivery options, but favored Resource Center technique. Suggested variety of strategies to formalize this particular option as a permanent part of the school.
   d) Step 4: Selecting Strategies
      1) Procedure: "Goodness-of-fit" and "Reasonableness" criteria
      2) Results: Chose to use required budgetary procedures as means of creating policy and role of Handicapped Resource Center.
7. Outcomes realized: Generated a purpose, role definition and budget for a service delivery option of a Resource Center. Further, succeeded in placing this Center in the most appropriate organizational structure.

8.	Problems encountered:	The process was time-consuming and needed more information on costing, attitudinal barriers and policy barriers.
9.	General evaluation:	Some portion of the materials were judged to have been useful to almost any local situation. Group techniques were considered excellent and helped produce good ideas, necessary consensus and support for getting things done.

Fig. 3. Field Test Results

The important points about the specific results were that the System worked effectively, that it was adaptable to a variety of educational settings and problems, that the group procedures were effective, that multiple procedures were beneficial, that results were useful and that the materials and procedures were clear. Depending upon the site, use of the Planning System required two to five months of elapsed time and 80 to 350 hours of administrative and staff time. Policy barriers, attitude barriers and architectural barriers were identified and specified; usable solutions requiring moderate resource expenditures were developed and implemented.

Findings Related to Usability

Findings related to usability of the Planning System have been grouped in three sections: reactions, reasons for use, and commitment. Findings were unusually consistent and served to suggest additional information needs for the materials, as well as future research questions.

Reactions. Consistent reactions to and evaluations of the materials were offered across all field test sites in terms of the logic of the Planning System, the suggested procedures, the format of the materials, and the use of group planning and decision-making techniques. Findings related to "reactions" were characterized as instances of considerable administrative support, primarily because the System gave local administrators control and discretion over the process, but did not require the administrator to accept the entire responsibility for outcomes of the process.

Every respondent judged the logic and adaptability of the Planning System to have been appropriate and useful. There was particular support for the step-wise progression within the planning materials because it permitted local units to be flexible in their use of the materials. Units that had completed some accessibility work could adapt the materials to their current situation rather than having to start at the beginning. There was support also for use of the suggested techniques for administrative record-keeping and for expanding Step 5, Implementing Barrier Removal, as a way of mandating further activity. Support for the logic of the system was included in the expression that administrators were appreciative of a practical administrative tool that was flexible and immediately applicable to local situations--a tool that was not esoteric and yet was systematic.

The emphasis on local decision-making was strongly supported, particularly the availability of alternative procedures within each step of the Planning System. As a result, administrators employed a variety of the techniques. They indicated that local decision-making increased their interest and willingness to use the materials. They believed that by being able to match local conditions to available options they increased the validity of their findings and the potential support for their program. In addition, each administrator expressed the opinion that, by providing for local decision-making rather than a single Federal requirement, the Planning System better meets the specific conditions of a variety of locales.

The format of self-instructional materials, divided into individual booklets was judged helpful by administrators. The prevailing opinion was that such a format met the time and energy constraints of adult learners and shortened the overall task.

The use of group decision-making procedures for program planning was supported across all test sites, although belatedly so in one educational unit. Advantages suggested by local administrators for use of such proce-

dures included the large number of ideas and points of view expressed, the support generated for selected ideas and strategies, and the personal gratification that derived to group members from being productive. One additional reason for supporting the use of group decision-making procedures was shared responsibility; by using group procedures, some of the responsibility for accessibility was shifted from an individual administrator to a group of people or local planning committee who had as a basic task or mission the creation of accessible programming.

Reasons for use. There was general consistency across field test sites regarding reasons why the Planning System was used. The reasons fell into three categories: requirements, personal considerations and organizational benefits. Findings related to reasons for use could be characterized as a case in which seemingly extraneous variables had a major influence on the way in which the materials were used.

The idea of requirements was an important reason for use of the Planning System in every unit. In two units, the primary requirement was an understanding of a moral obligation, coupled with organizational needs, to provide better and effective educational services for students with disabilities. In two units, the primary requirement was an understanding that Federal compliance mandated providing vocational education to disabled students.

Personal considerations also influenced the use of the Planning System in each of the four educational units. Personal considerations took the form of growth or advancement. In two units, personal growth was the major concern; the administrators expressed their desire to learn and use planning techniques that would be useful and usable in other situations. In two units, professional advancement was a greater concern than personal growth. Use of the materials was viewed as a means to the end of increased responsibility and authority.

The third reason for use of the Planning System was organizational benefits. While relatively less important than the other two reasons, there was a genuine concern for involving the community in developing accessible programs in three of the pilot units especially when such involvement might lead to increased support and increased enrollments. In the fourth unit, the primary organizational benefit expected was the public approval that efforts had been initiated to make the program and facilities accessible to all students.

Commitment, the third category of findings related to usability expanded findings related to reasons for use. Findings suggested that, in this instance, personal, rather than organizational, considerations determined the degree of commitment to the extent and efficiency of use of the materials. There was no Board commitment to completion of the process in any of the units; such decisions were deferred to the individual assigned responsibility for managing the planning process, each of whom occupied an organization position equal to the other individuals who directed the planning process at the other field test sites. The four individuals included two special educators and two vocational educators. The special educators were more thorough in their use of the planning materials than were the vocational educators. Subsequent interviews with each individual revealed that the special educators professed greater commitment to the process than did the vocational educators. When questioned about their commitment, the special educators indicated that planning for accessibility was one of their top priorities; vocational educators, however, indicated that their commitment was based on the concerns for compliance rather than a priority for serving handicapped students.

Suggested Revisions of the Materials

Suggested revisions were consistent and primarily dealt with either additional information to include or revising the language used in the materials. Language suggestions centered on eliminating jargon and redundancy. Recommended additional information was judged a more critical need and included consistent

suggestions across field test sites. Additional information suggestions that were mentioned in at least three sites included:

1) Directions about who, in terms of role within the educational unit, should have responsibility for conducting the planning process;
2) Several appropriate, continuous examples interspersed throughout the materials;
3) Additional graphics and illustrations;
4) Additional content on potential barriers, possible solutions, resources and exemplary programs/practices;
5) Additional samples of questionnaires for addressing attitude and policy barriers; and
6) More detailed directions about how to choose and adapt procedures to local settings.

CONCLUSIONS

Field test results suggested that, while some revisions were required in the materials before general use, the Planning System was a viable tool for planning for accessibility. Collected information using the System was valid, solutions were usable, program support was high, and resource investments were moderate. The use of alternative procedures within most planning steps coupled with the self-instructional format and the requirement for local decision-making was well received. Likewise, there was great support for the use of group procedures in program planning after using the materials.

The field test also suggested that administrators were ready, willing and capable of addressing the accessibility issue--particularly if the means for addressing accessibility improved programs, provided for personal growth and advancement and moved the system toward Federal compliance. Further, there was no hesitation to attack the issue vigorously if the accessibility effort was

given a high priority by the chief administrative officer of the educational unit and if one person was clearly assigned responsibility for using the Planning System.

Several future research questions were suggested by findings from the pilot. Among the more interesting were: (1) Would the results of a field-test of new materials and procedures be more useful if the degree of technical assistance offered educational units was systematically varied in order to derive a better idea of continuing information needs? (2) Do reasons for and ways of accepting innovation vary with the orientation to compliance or moral reasons for action? and (3) Does acceptance of innovation vary when introduced to individuals or individual education units as opposed to when introduced to groups or groups of education units? Answers to such questions might improve dissemination and acceptance of educational innovation in schools.